

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated June 19, 2003, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on September 19, 2003. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 1-29 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 4-10, 12-15, 19-37 remain pending following entry of this response. Claims 2-3, 11 and 16-18 have been cancelled by Applicant. Claims 30-37 have been added. Claims 1, 4, 7, 10, 12, 13-14, 19, 21, 24 and 27 are amended to correct matters of form and/or to clarify the invention.

Claims 1-9, and 19-29 stand rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by *Dean A. Klein*, (US 6,496,853; hereinafter *Klein*). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Klein is directed to the system for managing messages so that messages with redundant contents need not be viewed by a user. Messages with redundant contents can be managed by creating a new message which includes the contents of each of the identified messages but at most a single copy of the redundant contents. (See, Abstract.) In *Klein*, management of messages is done by a message manager 157 residing on a recipient computer system 150. (Fig. 1.) Significantly, the message manager 157 performs a redundancy check for each message received by the recipient computer system 150. (See, Fig. 4 and col. 9, lines 29-50.) That is, the message manager 157 has no way of discriminating between emails whereby selective email management could be achieved. Relatedly, no processing of emails is preformed by the sending computers to selectively identify emails as candidates for redundancy processing by a receiving computer. In contrast, the present claims configure outbound emails with -an attribute that identifies the email as one to be checked for redundancy with respect to other emails addressed to the same recipient. In this way, the sender of emails controls, in part, whether a given email will be checked for redundancy. If the attribute is present for a given email, a redundancy check is necessarily performed by a receiving computer. If the attribute is not present for a given email, a redundancy check is not necessarily performed by a receiving computer. No such functionality is performed by *Klein*. Therefore, *Klein* does not teach, show or suggest configuring an

outbound email with an attribute that causes a receiving computer to check the email for redundancy with respect to other emails addressed to the same recipient. Therefore, the claims are believed to be allowable and allowance of the same is respectfully request.

Claims 10-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Dean A. Klein* in view of *Jordan Pollack* (US 6505236). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Klein has been discussed and overcome above. Accordingly, *Klein* cannot be combined, as argued by the Examiner, with any reference to support an obviousness rejection. Therefore, a detail discussion of *Pollack* is not necessary. Briefly, Applicants point out that *Pollack* is directed only to a system for managing attachments to facilitate downloading and viewing the body of emails. Neither *Klein* nor *Pollack*, alone or in combination, teach, show or suggest configuring an outbound email with an attribute that causes a receiving computer to check the email for redundancy with respect to other emails addressed to the same recipient. Therefore, the claims are believed to be allowable and allowance of the same is respectfully request.

The secondary references made of record are noted. However, it is believed that the secondary references are no more pertinent than the primary references cited in the office action. Therefore, Applicants believe that a detailed discussion of the secondary references is not necessary for a full and complete response to this office action.

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



Gero G. McClellan
Registration No. 44,227
MOSER, PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd., Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (650) 330-2310
Facsimile: (650) 330-2314
Agent for Applicant(s)